

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of July 8, 1999.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the reasoning expressed in the Office Action, in order to expedite the prosecution of this case, Applicants are canceling claims 1-9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10-28 are added.

Accordingly, claims 10-28 are pending in this application.

The rejections of claims 1-9 are now moot.

The Rejections based on Cookson et al.

The present disclosure relates to an information record medium and information recording apparatus. The present disclosure is applicable to a wide range of signal processing and other applications, including MPEG and other processing available for the record medium.

New claims 10-28 are added to clarify the present invention. Subject matter relating to the new claims may be found in FIGs. 6-12 and page 31, line 5 through page 38, line 10 of the present application. Of new claims 10-28, claim 10, for example, recites a combination of elements including "navigation information including recording position information indicating recording positions of other reproduction units that belong to the same processed partial record information block, corresponding to a predetermined reproduction time of the partial record information blocks within a predetermined range before and after a respective one of the reproduction units on an axis of reproduction time of each of the partial record information blocks," e.g., the VOBU search

information disclosed in the specification. *Cookson et al.* fail to disclose any of the claimed combinations of the present invention which include such navigation information (e.g., such VOBU search information).

Instead, *Cookson et al.* disclose a technique to reproduce block information in an order indicated by a pointer (which is information extracted by the block number/pointer analyzer 47 in the reproducing apparatus of FIG. 2). Applicants advise that, according to *Cookson et al.*, by use of the pointer, which only indicates the block information to be reproduced next, it is not possible to perform actions such as fast forward reproduction, time search reproduction, reverse reproduction, and so on. Thus, Applicants advise that when reproducing a different version, the jump destination corresponding to the content indicated by the pointer is changed by the reproducing apparatus.

Thus, the advantages of the present invention cannot be achieved by *Cookson et al.*, and claim 10 is allowable over *Cookson et al.*.

Claims 11-12 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least because claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 13, 16, 21 and 24 are allowable for essentially the same reasons as those applicable to claim 1, as well for the features recited therein.

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and are allowable at least because claim 13 is allowable.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are allowable at least because claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and are allowable at least because claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 25-28 depend from claim 24 and are allowable at least because claim 24 is allowable.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the newly added claims are allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite the prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:


George S. Bardmessner
Reg. No. 44,020

Dated: November 17, 1999

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 467-7000

GSB/am